

## Report of the Head of Strategic Investment

## HEAVY WOOLLEN PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

**Date: 01-Jun-2018**

**Subject: Planning Application 2017/93294 Erection of extensions to dwelling and patio Cornmill Cottage, Corn Bottom Mill, Shelley, Huddersfield, HD8 8JJ**

**APPLICANT**

Mr Gibson

**DATE VALID**

27-Oct-2017

**TARGET DATE**

22-Dec-2017

EXTENSION EXPIRY DATE

14-Jun-2018

Please click the following link for guidance notes on public speaking at planning committees, including how to pre-register your intention to speak.

<http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/pdf/public-speaking-committee.pdf>

## LOCATION PLAN



**Map not to scale – for identification purposes only**

## Electoral Wards Affected: Kirkburton

No

Ward Members consulted  
(referred to in report)

### RECOMMENDATION:

**DELEGATE approval of the application and the issuing of the decision notice to the Head of Strategic Investment in order to complete the list of conditions including those contained within this report.**

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION:

- 1.1 The application is brought to the Heavy Woollen Planning Sub Committee at the request of Councillor Bill Armer for the following reasons:

*'The site is in, or "washed over by", Green Belt. It seems to me that there are potentially adverse effects upon the openness of the Green Belt should this application be allowed, and that both NPPF and KMC guidelines need to be carefully considered and perhaps interpreted. The applicant does not seem to me to provide evidence of "very special reasons" for the extension to be allowed, and I am informed that the amount of parking space owned by the applicant may have been misrepresented. I believe that the proposal is an inappropriate development given the Green Belt setting.*

*I note from an expert opinion, which I have had sight of, that there is some dispute over the volume of existing extensions to the host dwelling and how these should be calculated. I believe it is possible that this application, if granted, could amount to over-development of the site. I also believe that the host building could cease to be the dominant component of the extended dwelling.*

*Given the character, history and nature of this very small historic settlement, I fear that the proposal would have an unacceptable negative impact upon the "streetscene".*

- 1.2 The Chair of the Sub-Committee has confirmed that Councillor Bill Armer's reason for making this request is valid having regard to the Councillor's Protocol for Planning Committees.

### 2.0 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS:

- 2.1 The application site is Cornmill Cottage, Corn Bottom Mill, Shelley, Huddersfield, HD8 8JJ.
- 2.2 It is a long, two-storey detached house, which appears to have formerly been two dwellings, with porches to the front and single storey extensions to the side and rear. The external walls are natural stone and the roof is surfaced in stone slates.

- 2.3 There is off road hard standing, parking area to one side and garden area to the rear, stepped down and away from the back of the building, with paddock beyond at lower level, part of which was informally used as an allotment and accessed via an unmade track to the northern side of the parking places, but within the red line site boundary.
- 2.4 The access track and paddock also border the southern side of Shepley Dike, with mature trees subject to tree preservation orders (TPO's) lining the river bank.
- 2.5 The site is accessed via Long lane, (an unadopted lane from Dam Hill) serving several other properties in the hamlet of Corn Bottom Mill.
- 2.6 During the course of the application demolition and excavation works have taken place resulting in removal of a rear extension and significant excavation of the back garden, with access taken through part of retaining wall between the side of garden and track leading to paddock. A base course of crushed stones have been laid and the shape of the proposed building outlined by posts and tape. Some excavated material has been piled in part of the paddock and some stone together with wooden posts stacked in the remaining part of the garden lawn.

### **3.0 Description of Proposal**

- 3.1 Planning permission is sought for extensions to dwelling and raised patio.
- 3.2 The amended plans show the following:
- 3.3 Two-storey side extension (on footprint of existing side extension), projecting approximately 4.0m to the rear, with single storey element wrapping around the rear elevation on the footprint of the former rear extension, now demolished.
- 3.4 The two storey side extension has side facing gable end with eaves and ridge heights slightly below those of the existing house. The 2-storey element that projects to the rear has gable end facing the back with ridge level around 1.0m below that of the main part of the side extension.
- 3.5 It would provide space for a utility, kitchen and dining room at ground level with master bedroom with en-suite and dressing room above. It has windows to all elevations and those facing Long Lane would be to non-habitable room windows
- 3.6 The single storey element would have a mono-pitched roof with bi-folding doors leading out onto raised patio. It would provide space for a family room.
- 3.7 The external walls would be natural coursed stone and the roof would be in materials to match the existing
- 3.8 The patio would project approximately 4.0m and be around 15.3m wide with steps down into the back garden and planters to either side. It would be enclosed by a balcony around 1.0m high in a combination of stonework and glazed panels.

- 3.9 Other minor alterations include removing the garage door and replacing with new window and turning existing garage into games room. Forming new escape window in the rear elevation and blocking up door and window in the rear elevation and replacing with one window.

#### **4.0 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY (including enforcement history):**

- 4.1 87/04302 – erection of extension to form porch and wc. Granted conditional full permission.
- 4.2 03/91200 – erection of verandah extension. Refused.
- 4.3 03/92732 – erection of single storey extension. Conditional full permission.
- 4.4 18/91225 – householder permitted development extension prior notification for erection of single storey rear extension. Withdrawn.
- 4.5 18/91250 – works to trees TPO 01/77 – pending determination

#### **5.0 HISTORY OF NEGOTIATIONS (including revisions to the scheme):**

- 5.1 During the course of the application discussions have taken place to reduce the scale of the proposed development by removing an originally proposed detached triple garage with storage above located in the paddock and rejecting alternative proposal to form a double garage under the proposed extensions and patio.

#### **6.0 PLANNING POLICY:**

- 6.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that planning applications are determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan for Kirklees currently comprises the saved policies within the Kirklees Unitary Development Plan (Saved 2007). The Council's Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government on 25th April 2017, so that it can be examined by an independent inspector. The Examination in Public began in October 2017. The weight to be given to the Local Plan will be determined in accordance with the guidance in paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework. In particular, where the policies, proposals and designations in the Local Plan do not vary from those within the UDP, do not attract significant unresolved objections and are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), these may be given increased weight. At this stage of the Plan making process the Publication Draft Local Plan is considered to carry significant weight. Pending the adoption of the Local Plan, the UDP (saved Policies 2007) remains the statutory Development Plan for Kirklees.
- 6.2 The application site is located within the allocated Green Belt on the Kirklees UDP proposals map and as part of the Kirklees PDLP.
- 6.3 Kirklees Unitary Development Plan (UDP) Saved Policies 2007:

**BE1** – design principles

**BE2** – quality of design

**BE13** – extensions to dwellings (design principles)

**BE14** – extensions to dwellings (scale)

**D11** – extensions in the green Belt

6.4 Kirklees Draft Publication Local Plan:

**PLP24** – design

**PLP57** – extensions within the Green Belt

6.5 National Planning Guidance:

**Chapter 7** – Requiring good design

**Chapter 9** – Protecting Green Belt land

**Chapter 10** – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

**7.0 PUBLIC/LOCAL RESPONSE:**

7.1 The application was advertised by site notices and neighbour notification letters

7.2 Representations have been received from six sources. The main points raised are summarised as follows:

- The owner has a small piece of land across the road from his house which could be altered to allow for parking for at least 3 cars.
- Further extensions will totally alter the appearance of the property and have an adverse impact upon the surrounding area.
- The proposed extension forms disproportionate additions over and above the size of the property as it was in 1948, and would have an adverse impact upon the openness of the Green Belt.
- The area was recently recognised as particularly special, describing it as a 'sylvan' (or inhabiting the woods) location in recent decision by the Planning Inspectorate relating to the property opposite for a new house to replace workshop buildings, which was dismissed.
- Substantial excavation works have already taken place at the site.
- Demolition has also taken place and it is understood that any replacement should be considered on its own merits (ie. as if the demolished building had never existed) as it stands this is a new building in the Green Belt and requires serious consideration.
- There is concern about tree on the streamside and request stronger protection.
- There is concern about the tipping of excavated materials on the field at the back which has flooded for a number of days this winter.
- The applicant may be attempting to establish a new curtilage of the property without going through due process.
- Southerly extension (to existing garage) would overhang neighbouring property.
- Appearance of proposed northerly extension would present a large rectangular wall rather than a tidy, proportionate gable when viewed from the north.

## 8.0 CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

### 8.1 Statutory:

None carried out during the course of this application

### 8.2 Non-statutory:

**K C Arboricultural officer:** The trees subject to a tree preservation order should not be affected by the proposed development. An application to carry out works to protected trees along the riverbank has been received during the course of this application and is being assessed.

## 9.0 MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development
- Impact on the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt
- Residential amenity
- Highway issues
- Flood risk and Drainage issues
- Representations
- Other matters

## 10.0 APPRAISAL

### Principle of development

10.1 The application site lies within the Green Belt and the main issue is the impact upon the proposed development on the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt.

10.2 Paragraph 89 of the NPPF states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this include the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

10.3 Policy D11 of the UDP relates to extensions to buildings within the Green Belt and states that:

Proposals for the extension of buildings within the green belt will be considered having regard to:

- i the impact on the openness and character of the green belt;
- ii the size of the extension in relation to the existing building which should remain the dominant element;

And, in the case of traditional buildings,

- iii the effect on the character of the existing building.

In the case of proposals to extend buildings which have already been extended the proposal should have regard to the scale and character of the original part of the building.

- 10.4 Policy PLP 57 of the emerging Local Plan relates to the extension, alteration or replacement of existing buildings within the Green Belt. It states:

Proposals for the extension, alteration or replacement of buildings in the green belt will normally be acceptable provided that:

- a. in the case of extensions the host building remains the dominant element both in terms of size and overall appearance. The cumulative impact of previous extensions and of other associated buildings will be taken into account. Proposals to extend buildings which have already been extended should have regard to the scale and character of the original part of the building;
  - b. in the case of replacement buildings, the new building must be in the same use as and not be materially larger than the building it is replacing;
  - c. the proposal does not result in a greater impact on openness in terms of the treatment of outdoor areas, including hard standings, curtilages and enclosures and means of access; and
  - d. the design and materials used should be sensitive to the character of the green belt setting.
- 10.5 The principle of the development is accepted subject to an assessment of the above policies.

Impact upon the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt

- 10.6 In order to assess the proposed extensions in relation to local and national Green Belt policy it is first necessary to establish what constitutes the original building. The original building is defined as a building as it existed on 1<sup>st</sup> July 1948 (if it was built before that date) or as it was built when built after 1<sup>st</sup> July 1948.

In this instance, the property was formerly a pair of two-storey cottages dating from before July 1948.

- 10.7 The original building has been extended since 1948 with a porch and single storey extension to the front, single storey extensions to either side, and two single storey extensions to the rear. Whilst these add some massing at ground floor level, it is officers' opinion that these do not form disproportionate additions to the building as it was in 1948.

- 10.8 The current proposal involves removal of the single storey side extension (attached to the northern side of the house), and demolition of one of the single storey rear extensions (which has already been carried out).
- 10.9 In terms of extra massing from the proposed extensions this would be confined effectively to the first floor element above the existing single storey side extension, and two-storey element which projects 4.1m. Both of these elements would have eaves and ridge level below that of the original, and their projection to the side would be considerably less than the length of the original part of the house. As noted above, the proposed single storey rear extension would effectively be a replacement of the rear extension that was removed during the course of this application.
- 10.10 The proposed patio would be approximately 0.8m above the existing garden at the back with steps down into a further lawned area. It would project a further 4.0m at the back and be around 15m wide and as such amount to a fairly substantial raised area. In these circumstances it is appropriate to remove permitted development rights for further development.
- 10.11 After careful consideration and on balance, given that the current proposal would replace two of the other previously approved extensions (to the side and rear) and would retain the height and length of the original part of the building as the predominant element, in officers' opinion the cumulative impact of the existing and proposed extensions would not be disproportionate to the scale and size of the original part of the building and would not unduly harm the openness of the Green Belt. This would be an exemption to being inappropriate development set out in paragraph 89 of the NPPF and therefore very special circumstances are not required. It would also accord with policies D11 of the UDP and PLP57 of the Kirklees DPLP.
- 10.12 In terms of design, the proposed extensions would be in matching external materials and roof styles would reflect those on the existing house, whilst the window and door openings in officers' opinion are appropriate for a domestic extension. When viewed from Long Lane, whilst the side elevation would be quite large, there would be an appropriate balance of openings to solid walling, which would mitigate the solidity of that elevation. In all, the proposed design of the extensions is considered acceptable from a visual amenity perspective and would accord with the aims of Policies BE, BE2 and BE13 of the UDP, Policy PLP24 of the PDLP and chapter 7 of the NPPF.

#### Residential Amenity

- 10.13 The proposed extensions would be to the northern side and rear elevation of the existing building, which is at least 23m from the nearest neighbouring properties at Valley House and Millwood House, and there is no direct relationship to habitable room windows. As such in officers' opinion there would be no significant impact upon residential amenities of these neighbouring properties.
- 10.14 In relation to Barn Cottage, the proposed single storey rear extension would be closest to the mutual boundary, however given that it would effectively replace a similar extension that has recently been demolished, there would be no further prejudicial impact upon the residential amenities of the occupiers of this neighbouring property. The proposed raised patio would be around 2.0m from



the mutual boundary, but approximately 18m from the nearest part of the house at Barn Cottage with hedges, trees and other extensions in between, as such it is thought that this impact would be minimal.

- 10.15 No other properties would be affected by the proposed development. As such, in all, the proposal is, in the opinion of officers, satisfactory from a residential amenity perspective.

#### Highway issues

- 10.16 The application site is accessed from the nearest adopted highway (Dam Hill) via, Long Lane, an unadopted, single width road serving several houses in this hamlet.
- 10.17 The existing property has an integral garage to one side and off street parking for one or two cars at the opposite side.
- 10.18 The proposal includes converting the existing garage into ancillary residential accommodation and could be carried out without requiring planning permission.
- 10.19 The enlarged house would have 4 bedrooms and require 3 off street parking spaces.
- 10.20 The proposed site plan indicates space (approximately 6m wide by 12m deep) to the side of the proposed side extension. Provided that this area is surfaced in material suitable for parking cars, and retained as such, then this would provide adequate off street parking provision and it is recommended that this is conditioned.

#### Drainage issues

- 10.21 The application site borders Shepley Dyke and records indicate that the paddock part of the side and rear garden are in flood risk zones 2 and 3a. A flood risk assessment was submitted with the application which focused on a proposal for a detached triple garage in the paddock area which has, during the course of the application, been removed.
- 10.22 The currently proposed extensions would be largely on the footings of the existing extensions and the proposed patio would be approximately 0.4m above the parking area to the side of the proposed extension. Taking these factors into account, the proposal is not considered to result in any undue flood risk issues and would accord with the aims of chapter 10 of the NPPF.

#### Representations

- 10.23 Representations have been received from six sources. The issues raised are summarised and addressed by officers as follows:
- The owner has a small piece of land across the road from his house which could be altered to allow for parking for at least 3 cars.  
**Response:** This is not within the application site boundary.

- Further extensions will totally alter the appearance of the property and have an adverse impact upon the surrounding area.

**Response:** The proposed side and rear extension have been fully assessed above in regard to their scale, design etc, and subsequent impact on both visual amenity and the impact upon the Green Belt. Whilst they will add some scale and volume to one side of the house and at the back, they partly replace existing side and rear elevations, their overall height is below that of the original part of the house. The proposed external materials and roof styles are also in keeping with the host dwelling and the fenestration is considered to be appropriate for a domestic extension. Therefore on balance it is officer's opinion that although the proposal will alter the appearance of the property to some extent, this would not have a significantly adverse impact upon the character of the area.

- The proposed extension forms disproportionate additions over and above the size of the property as it was in 1948, and would have an adverse impact upon the openness of the Green Belt.

**Response:** In this instance, the property was formerly a pair of two-storey cottages dating from before July 1948. The original building has been extended since 1948 with a porch and single storey extension to the front, single storey extensions to either side, and two single storey extensions to the rear.

The current proposal involves removal of the single storey side extension (attached to the northern side of the house), and demolition of one of the single storey rear extensions (which has already been carried out).

In terms of extra massing from the proposed extensions this would be confined effectively to the first floor element above the existing single storey side extension, and two-storey element which projects 4.1m. Both of these elements would have eaves and ridge level below that of the original, and their projection to the side would be considerably less than the length of the original part of the house. As noted above, the proposed single storey rear extension would effectively be a replacement of the rear extension that was removed during the course of this application.

The proposed patio would be approximately 0.8m above the existing garden at the back with steps down into a further lawned area. It would project a further 4.0m at the back and be around 15 m wide and as such amount to a fairly substantial raised area. In these circumstances it is appropriate to remove permitted development rights for further development.

On balance, given that the current proposal would replace two of the other previously approved extensions (to side and rear) and would retain the height and length of the original part of the building as the predominant element, in officers' opinion the cumulative impact of the existing and proposed extensions would not be disproportionate to the scale and size of the original part of the building and would not unduly harm the openness of the Green Belt.

- The area was recently recognised as particularly special, describing it as a 'sylvan' (or inhabiting the woods) location in recent decision by the Planning Inspectorate relating to the property opposite for new house to replace workshop buildings, which was dismissed.

**Response:** This is noted and Members of the Committee will be visiting the site.

- Substantial excavation works have already taken place at the site.  
**Response:** This has been noted and Committee members will be making a site visit prior to the committee meeting.
- Demolition has also taken place and it is understood that any replacement should be considered on its own merits (ie. as if the demolished building had never existed) as it stands this is a new building in the Green Belt and requires serious consideration.  
**Response:** It is recognised that some demolition has taken place and the cumulative impact of the existing extensions and the proposed extensions and patio have been given serious consideration in relation to Green Belt policy and on balance and subject to conditions, are not thought to form disproportionate additions over and above the original part of the house.  
The proposal has not been considered as a new building in the Green Belt.
- There is concern about trees on the streamside and request stronger protection.  
**Response:** During the course of the application development has started on site and the Trees officers informed. The applicant / agent was warned that it would be an offence to damage protected trees which may result in a fine and strongly advised that they ensure no further works take place within the root spread of the trees.  
An application to carry out works to trees adjacent to the riverbank has been received and is being assessed.
- There is concern about the tipping of excavated materials on the field at the back which has flooded for a number of days this winter.  
**Response:** The architect has explained to an enforcement officer that the tipping in the field behind is only temporary storage of the excavated earth. Most of it will be used for back-fill when the extension and raised patio is ready for it, and the rest will be used at another development site. The enforcement officer is assured that the field (paddock) will be restored when it is all done. This would be permitted development if the application is approved. If it is refused (and any appeal dismissed) it will go back into the hole they have dug.
- The applicant may be attempting to establish a new curtilage of the property without going through due process.  
**Response:** This is noted. During the course of the application a triple garage element positioned in the paddock was removed, and should the current application be approved it is recommended that a footnote could be added that the permission does not authorise the extension of the residential curtilage to the whole of the area outlined in red on the submitted plan. Alternatively the red line boundary could be reduced to encompass just the house in its enlarged form with patio and garden to the boundary wall with the paddock. The paddock and access track could be outlined in blue together with any other adjacent land in the same ownership.
- Southerly extension (to existing garage) would overhang neighbouring property.  
**Response:** The proposed plan and elevation drawings indicate that there would be no alterations to the existing garage other than to remove the garage door and insert window together with removal of door and window in the rear elevation and insertion of one window and its use would be as a games-room ancillary to the main house. All these would be permitted development.

- Appearance of proposed northerly extension would present a large rectangular wall rather than a tidy, proportionate gable when viewed from the north.

**Response:** The proposed side extension, when viewed from the northern approach road would look quite large, however part of it would retain a gable subservient to the ridge height of the original element of the house and the section which projects to the rear is lower still. Windows or false windows are shown in the north facing elevation (elevation B) which it is considered shows an appropriate balance of openings to solid walling.

Therefore on balance, it is officers' opinion that the scale is acceptable in terms of visual amenity and impact upon the openness and character of the Green Belt

### Other Matters

#### 10.24 Protected species (trees):

10.25 Several mature trees line the southern bank of the Shepley Dyke and border the northern boundary of the application site. They are subject to a Tree Preservation Order and contribute to the visual amenity of the area.

10.26 The current proposal has been informally assessed by the Council's Arboricultural officers who are content that the proposed development would not harm the TPO'd trees.

10.27 It is noted that development works have begun on site and the agent / developer warned of the implications should damage be caused to the protected trees. It is also noted that since then an application to carry out works (including felling) to these trees has been submitted and is under consideration.

#### 10.28 Curtilage issues:

10.29 The location plan has a red line boundary which encompassed the house garden to the rear and paddock beyond, together with track to the side leading to paddock and extends along Long Lane to the junction with adopted highway at Dam Hill.

10.30 The initially submitted application included a detached triple garage located on the paddock and access from the track leading to it. Concern was expressed in the representations that the siting of the detached garage is not on land within the planning unit or domestic curtilage, and that this would require a change of use and including in the description of the proposal.

10.31 During the course of the application this element of the proposal was removed, and should the current application be approved it is recommended that a footnote could be added that the permission does not authorise the extension of the residential curtilage to the whole of the area outlined in red on the submitted plan. Alternatively the red line boundary could be reduced to encompass just the house in its enlarged form with patio and garden to the boundary wall with the paddock. The paddock and access track could be outlined in blue together with any other adjacent land in the same ownership.

### 10.32 Unauthorised works:

- 10.33 During the course of the application unauthorised works have been carried out at the site. At an early stage the agent was strongly advised to cease works until the outcome of the current application is known and that any works that are carried out before determination are completely at their own risk. This was repeated several times afterwards and warning was given about the potential impact upon protected trees adjacent to the riverside. In addition it was referred to the enforcement team. Further work has taken place since and resulted in the circumstances that are currently at the site which include demolition of an extension at the back, considerable excavation works at the rear of the property, laying some crushed stone, marking out the footprint and mounding of excavated material in the paddock. The agent has confirmed by email that the area below the finished floor of the proposed extensions and the patio will be filled as part of the construction.

## 11.0 CONCLUSION

- 11.1 Although the proposal would create extra massing above the existing single storey side extension, projecting 4.0m to the rear and raised patio, the cumulative impact of the existing and proposed extension would, in the view of officers, all be subservient to the overall height and length of the original part of the building. After careful consideration, on balance it is officer's opinion that they do not amount to disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. As such the proposal would be an exemption to being inappropriate development set out in paragraph 89 of the NPPF and so very special circumstances would not be required. It would also accord with policies D11 of the UDP and PLP57 of the Kirklees PDLP.
- 11.2 The NPPF has introduced a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The policies set out in the NPPF taken as a whole constitute the Government's view of what sustainable development means in practice.
- 11.3 This application has been assessed against relevant policies in the development plan and other material considerations. It is considered that the development would constitute sustainable development and is therefore recommended for approval.

## 12.0 **CONDITIONS (Summary list. Full wording of conditions including any amendments/additions to be delegated to the Head of Strategic Investment)**

1. 3 year time limit permission
2. Development in accordance with approved plans
3. Removing permitted development rights for extensions, alterations to the roof, outbuilding, porches.
4. Area shown on the proposed site plan to the side of the side extensions to be surfaced in material suitable for parking cars and retained as such thereafter.
5. Tree protection measures to be installed prior to construction commencing and retained for duration of construction phase

## Background Papers:

Application and history files.

Website link to application details:

<http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2017%2f93294>

History files

87/04302 - <http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=87/04302>

03/92732 - <http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2003%2F92732>

18/91225- <http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2018%2f91225>

18/91250- <http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/beta/planning-applications/search-for-planning-applications/detail.aspx?id=2018%2f91250>

Certificate of Ownership B – Notice served on:

Simon and Andrea Heppenstall – 3, Long Lane, Shelley  
The Occupier – Valley House, Long Lane, Shelley  
The Occupier – Round Wood, Long Lane, Shelley  
The Occupier - Millwood House, Long Lane, Shelley  
The Occupier – Barn Cottage, Long Lane, Shelley